

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 18, 1860.

NO. 40.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above *Harpers' Buildings*) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,
as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law, our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE DECEIVABLENESS OF UNRIGHTEOUSNESS.

In a former article we have noticed the "Key Note of the *Independent's* attack on the *Mission of Dr. Cheever*"—and, in part, its claims of agreement with him in anti-slavery sentiment and principle. We have seen that it "could not consent" that Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans should enjoy the reputation, in England, of being better abolitionists than the Editor of the *Independent*, and Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church. And, accordingly, it labored to convey the impression that Dr. Cheever is only a representative and specimen of New York and New-England Congregationalists in general, in his views of the slave question.

We come now to consider, more particularly, the artful manner in which the *Independent* labored to produce this impression, while, at the same time, with equal art and solicitude, it avoided planting itself, *in reality*, on the same foundation with Dr. Cheever, the younger Edwards, Dr. Hopkins, the abolitionists of "the land of Welberforce and Cowper" and the "pioneers and early confessors" of the "genuine Christian Anti-Slavery sentiment in the United States"—with all of whom it seemed to claim identity of anti-slavery principle and sentiment.

We do not object to the *Independent's* taking any position it chooses, on the anti-slavery question, but we shall not allow it, without exposure, to play a double game—to identify itself, before the British public, with the anti-slavery principles and sentiments of "the land of Cowper and Wilberforce"—with "Hopkins and the younger Edwards"—with "Dr. Cheever"—and with "the pioneers and early confessors" of "the genuine Christian anti-slavery sentiment in the United States"—(among the earliest of whom we claim to have a place) for the purpose of acquiring the influence and the ability to strike down, in the persons of Dr. Cheever and his associates in the Church of the Puritans, the fortress which, in the good Providence, and by the spirit and the Word of God they have been enabled to erect in this central city, the very seat of the beast we are contending against, whose leading ecclesiastics have once stirred up the rabble of the baser sort to deeds of violence against us and who, we are well assured, would gladly do it again, if they could.—Especially shall we not allow The *Independent*, undetected, and unexposed, to do this, in so sly and artful a manner as to leave itself at liberty, after having effected its malignant object, to turn another short corner, and ply its old work of pouring contempt and obloquy upon the "principles and sentiments" which it now seeks to entwine as a garland upon its brow.

By a close examination of the *Independent's* words and phrases, it will be seen that it carefully avoided using the language of those with whose sentiments and principles it

was, for the time being, desirous of indentifying itself. It did not describe the position of Hopkins and the second Edwards in their own honest unambiguous language as asserting "the absolute sinfulness" of slaveholding. It did not, as it could not, cite the Resolution of the General Association (Congregational) of the State of New-York, as declaring that "the holding of human beings as" slaves "is an immorality" &c. The word slave was carefully avoided in these statements. And instead of slave holding is substituted the words "holding human beings as chattels"—"holding human beings as property" &c.

Why is all this? Because the *Independent* belongs to the school of sophisters who seek to shield slave-holders, persistent slave-holders, known and admitted to be such, from church discipline and church censure, on the ground that the mere act of slave-holding does not necessarily involve the holding of human beings as chattels or property. So they can adopt resolutions condemning, as an immorality, the holding of human beings as property, as chattels, and then, the next moment, invite to their pulpits, and to their communion tables, without hesitation or scruple, any slaveholder that comes along,—deriding as "fanatics" and branding as "disorganizing" or as "infidels" those who insist that slaveholders ought to be excluded from the pulpit, from the communion table, and from the Church.

And this explains the resolution of the General Association of New York. Undoubtedly there were many who not only voted for it, (as Dr. Cheever himself might have done) but who, in the simple integrity of their hearts, might have been satisfied with it as meaning—as indeed it *ought* to mean—all that is included in the word "slaveholding." But it was not thus, nor with this understanding, "that the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church," who is Editor of The *Independent*, introduced and voted for it, nor was it thus that large numbers of others voted for it, as is proved by its being "adopted without a dissenting voice." So that its adoption is no test of the sentiments and principles of the Association, nor of its practice, in the matter of holding fellowship with slaveholders, by admitting or retaining them as church members, or inviting them into their pulpits, or to the table of communion.

The facts as we understand them, were these: Dr. Cheever introduced the original Resolution, in which the word slaveholding was made use of. "The pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle church" opposed it, and afterward offered the one against holding human beings as property—which was adopted. There is no reason to believe that the subject would have been introduced into the Association at all, if it had not been introduced by Dr. Cheever, or by some one who would willingly vote against slaveholding. But, as the Resolution had been introduced, it became necessary to do something with it. It would not do to reject it without adopting a substitute, lest the Association should incur the reproach of being pro-slavery. And so a Resolution must be adopted that would not subject it to the reproach of being anti-slavery, to the extent of excluding slaveholders from christian communion.

And now the *Independent* represents this as placing the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church, on the same anti-slavery platform with Dr. Cheever and the Church of the Puritans! And—in order to clinch the logic, it represents Dr. Cheever as having for years, retained knowingly, a slaveholder in full communion, in his church, (reviving in this statement, an old slander of the N. Y. Observer, a bitter enemy of Dr. Cheever and of abolitionism—slander, which Dr. Cheever had, long ago, branded as a falsehood) thus suggesting, we think, by the bye, the legitimate inference that "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church" represented as standing on the same platform, would readily receive a slaveholder into his church!

And finally it seeks to press Dr. Cheever himself, into an endorsement of its claim and its platform, by stating, that in a recent sermon, he "defined slaveholding to mean the making merchandise of men, whether stealing, selling or holding."—This definition, continues the *Independent*, "comes back precisely, to the doctrine of the Resolution, and the Resolution has the advantage of avoiding all ambiguity, and striking right at the heart of the sin. This is no new doctrine in the Congregational churches of New York and New England."

It is easy to see the fallacy of this. Understanding, as Dr. Cheever does, that slaveholding, and the holding of human beings as chattels, or property, are one and the same thing, it was no "coming back" no shifting or deserting of his position, but on the contrary, re-affirming it, when he said what the *Independent* quotes him as saying. But while denying, as does the *Independent* and "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church," that slaveholding and holding human beings as property are identical, it is not coming on to the same platform with Dr. Cheever, "the pioneers and early confessors" of the "genuine Christian anti-slavery sentiment in the United States"—"Dr. Hopkins and the second Edwards," and the abolitionists of "the land of Welberforce and Cowper" for the *Independent* and "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church," to affirm, as in the Resolution of the General Association of New York, (adroitly shaped by him,) that "the holding of human beings as property, is an immorality, the renunciation of which ought to be made a condition of membership in the christian church," &c. &c. For that declaration, taken along with the denial, of the identity (which Dr. Cheever affirms), of slaveholding with holding property in man, leaves him at full liberty, as he intended to be left, to hold religious and church fellowship with slaveholders, under the pretense that they do not hold human beings as property! The *Independent* did not mean to take back its complacent and gratulatory announcement, made not long since, that "the excommunicating or excommunication of slaveholders, as a principle of Church discipline, is almost universally repudiated!" Nor did it mean to recall its superscilious sneer at Dr. Cheever, in another article, in which it spoke of him, as "that eminent witness of an almost universally repudiated principle of Church discipline." It did not mean to endorse, nor to cease repudiating and deriding the sentiment of Dr. Hopkins, which stands on the church records at Newport, in which, connecting slavery with the slave trade, they were both together condemned, with the decisive resolution: "therefore, we will not tolerate it in this church," a resolution carried out by the excommunication of slaveholders.

No! Nothing at all of this. The object of "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle church," in substituting property holding for "slaveholding," in that Resolution of the General Association, evidently was to avoid censure and church discipline against slaveholders, while seeming, at the same time, to agree with Dr. Hopkins, Dr. Cheever, the pioneers and early confessors of American anti-slavery, and the abolitionists of Great Britain, all of whom were known to have taken the opposite ground.

If any one doubts this, let him try to get the endorsement of the *Independent*, "the pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle church," Rev. Dr. Leonard Bacon, the Congregational General Associations of New-York, Connecticut, or Massachusetts, to Dr. Cheever's definition of "slaveholding" as meaning "the making merchandise of men, whether stealing, selling or holding." The *Independent* says this definition places Dr. Cheever on its own platform. Will it place itself there, by making the same definition? It says "this is no new doctrine in the Congregational churches of New York and New England." Will it help Dr. Cheever, and the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and the Principia, in

persuading these churches to adopt it, and to act upon it, by excluding from church membership, those who "make merchandise of men, whether by stealing, selling, or holding?"

And yet, the Independent has the effrontery to charge Dr. Cheever with "ambiguity" in preferring the word "slaveholding," the very word that it rejects for the reason that it is *not* ambiguous, and cannot be used in common, by those who hold radically opposite sentiments, resulting in diametrically opposite measures! "Ambiguous," according to Webster, is "having two or more meanings, doubtful, being of uncertain signification, susceptible of different interpretations, hence obscure." Which of the two terms, "slaveholding," or "holding human beings as *property*?" is found, by the experiment in the General Association of New York, to be ambiguous? Which of them was it, that could not unite the votes of that body, because they were disagreed. And which of them was it that was artfully and successfully employed to unite the votes of those known to hold the most opposite sentiments on the great practical question before the country, and on the measures that ought to be adopted by the churches and the ministry, in respect to it?

Suppose it were universally understood, and admitted that, as Dr. Cheever affirms—"slaveholding means the *making merchandise of men*, whether stealing, selling, or holding"—would the General Association of New York have voted for the Resolution, as amended by "the Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle," any sooner than it would have voted for the original Resolution of Dr. Cheever? Would "the Pastor" have thus shaped and presented it? Would the Independent have approved of it, if it had passed? Certainly not. To say otherwise would be saying that the opposition to Dr. Cheever's original Resolution was capricious, and that the amendment was meaningless and useless. It was the *ambiguity*, then, of the amended Resolution that secured its success, and for its ambiguity it was preferred. It was an ambiguity founded, *not* indeed in any defect or inappropriateness of the words themselves, honestly used, but on the "*logomachy*" artfully introduced to bewilder, perplex, and mislead—and all for the purpose of shielding slaveholders from religious reproof and Church discipline.

We have another significant fact, just here. The Principia of March 3d, as before stated, propounded to The Independent this plain question, namely:

"Is it inherently sinful to hold human beings as slaves, under the system of Slavery, as established in the United States?"

To this the Independent only responded thus—

"That depends entirely upon what is meant by a *Slave* and by *inherently sinful*." It attempted no definitions of its own.

The Principia replied by quoting Webster's definition of the words "inherent"—"inherence"—"inherently"—"slaveholding"—and "slaveholders." Also by referring the Independent to its own meaning of the word *slave* in its previous questions to the N. Y. Observer.

This drew forth the following and final answer from the Independent of March 12.

A WORD TO PRINCIPIA.—An editor who has lived seventy years, or half that time, ought to know that the question whether sinfulness "inheres" in any subject or act, or can be predicated only of *motives*, is one of the most vexed questions of moral philosophy; and also that the definition of a slave—especially as respects the idea of *property*—is by no means settled in lexicography. And yet he expects questions, framed in such ignorance of philosophy and language, to be answered by a simple Yes or No. We cannot oblige him by entering into that wordy warfare, which marks a certain school of Abolitionists. We commend to *The Principia* Hebrews v. 12.

Notice the words "especially as respects the idea of *property*!" Driven from its shelter under the pretended ambiguity of the words "inherently" and "slave" the Independent finally took refuge under the pretended ambiguity of the word "property" in its application to slaves!

This was in March, 1860. How came the Independent to think of the "ambiguity of the word *property*" as applied to slaves? Was the "Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle Church" then thinking of his own use of that ambiguous word, in penning the Resolution of the General Association of New York in "September last?" And did he, as Editor of the Independent conveniently forget that ambiguity of the word "property" of which he was so cognizant,

"in September last" and also in March last, when, July 12, he informs his readers that "the Resolution (of September) has the advantage of avoiding all ambiguity" by substituting the word "*property*" for "Dr. Cheever's equivocal form of statement that slaveholding under all circumstance is sinful?"

And so there are no words in the language, it would seem, sufficiently free from "ambiguity" to describe or to define the act which constitutes the great and crying sin of our nation, its churches, and thousands upon thousands of church members, so as to fix the blame upon any body in particular, or exclude any body from the Church! If abolitionists call for church discipline of slaveholders, they are told that the "mere legal relation of slaveholder involves no guilt." If abolitionists, in disproof of this, dwell on the sin of holding human beings as *property*, they are told that *Christian* slaveholders do not hold their slaves as property at all; so that there is no foundation for excommunicating them, unless it be for some particular "abuses growing out of the relation, the same as out of other relations." The word *slaveholder* is equivocal. "The idea of *property*" in a slave is also equivocal, being "by no means settled in lexicography."

Such is "the wordy warfare," such is "the rubbish of logomachy" by which, for a quarter of a century past, artful and designing men in the ministry, who love to have the pre-eminence, have turned aside the arrows of God's truth directed at the sin of slaveholding, or of holding property in man. Such is "the art of definition and analysis"—to borrow a phrase of the Independent—by which they have managed to "daub with untempered mortar" and "heal the hurt of the daughter of Zion slightly," pioneering the way for a class of politicians of the same character, seeking to ride into power on the merit of their eloquent denunciations of "the wicked Fugitive Slave Bill" which, nevertheless, with the Independent's approbation, they promise to "execute in good faith," even supporting a Presidential candidate who tells us he should regret any agitation for its repeal or even its modification!

And this is the type of anti-slavery that claims identity with that of "the land of Wilberforce and Cowper"—with that of "Dr. Hopkins and the younger Edwards"—with that of "the pioneers and early confessors" of "genuine Christian Anti-Slavery in the United States"—with that of "Dr. Cheever" and the "Church of the Puritans." And all for the obvious object of preventing such an unity of effort and action between the abolitionists of both hemispheres as shall defeat the conspiracy to crush the Church of the Puritans and its Pastor, and introduce the consummation so honestly avowed, in 1856, by one whom the Independent then lauded as a "profound and sagacious logician, a venerable theologian, a Nestor among ministers of the gospel,"* who, in reference to the then anticipated success of the Republican party, (now anticipated again) rejoiced in the prospect that it would "give abolitionism *proper* so profound a burial that it shall disturb and trouble no more."

If Christian abolitionists, "in the land of Wilberforce and Cowper," desire a consummation like this, they will listen to the advice of the Independent, and stand aloof from the Church of the Puritans.

*The late Rev. Dr. Taylor of New Haven. *The Independent* then said. "We thank him for his appeal, and thank God who has given grace to make it," but added, (for obvious purposes,) "What he calls abolitionism proper, is abolitionism most improper!"

SINGULAR PROPOSAL OF A SLAVEHOLDER TO AN ABOLITIONIST.

Russell Co. Ala., July 23d, 1860.

Hon. Gerrit Smith. Sir.—You and I are antipodes on the subject of slavery. I believe it to be a divine institution created by heaven, and such is the doctrine of the Bible. African slavery has christianized and civilized, during the same length of time more human beings, than all the missionaries of the world combined. If it was not for the injudicious and unwise laws against the slave trade, by importation and moral instruction, we would make them Christians by the million, and prepare their souls for heaven. You are mistaken in supposing that we do not give our slaves Christian instruction. Large numbers of them are members of the churches, and we rely principally on the Bible when instructing them in obedience to their masters. However, I do not desire to argue the question of slavery with you, as between us there is an impassable gulf.

But we concur on one point, a separation of the free and

slave states into distinct governments. Last winter Alabama passed a law without a dissenting voice, that in the event of a black Republican president being elected, she would dissolve her connection with the union. This is the sentiment of every cotton state, and they will all unite with her. When this is done, all the other slave states will follow immediately, if obedience is attempted to be enforced, and ultimately, any how. To effect this object, we, the disunion party, disrupted the Democratic Convention at Charleston, and at Baltimore induced others to join us, by our agreeing to support men not entirely of our sentiments. We do not desire their election, but believe them the most available men to divide the Democratic party and elect Mr. Lincoln. We wish his elevation to the presidential chair, because we know it will produce a dissolution of the Union.

I perceive you are advocating the formation of a ticket more in conformity with your sentiments. This will only injure the Republican candidate. As your party and mine concur in desiring a separation of the free and the slave states, let us unite our efforts to accomplish this grand object. Notwithstanding our sentiments on this subject, we have waived running a candidate on that direct issue; simply because we can better destroy the political parties which now bind the union together, without doing it. Can not the anti-slavery party exercise policy also, and vote the Republican ticket, which will assist in accomplishing an object we both desire. We, the disunionists of the South, have adopted a politic course, and why should not the disunionists of the North? If you cannot conscientiously do so, will you be kind enough to make this subject public, so that the anti-slavery party or so many of them as can vote the Republican ticket, will comprehend the reasons for so doing. Your obedient Servant

JOHN DRIVER.

NOTE FROM GERRIT SMITH IN REFERENCE TO THE PRECEDING.

PETERBORO, Aug. 1st, 1860.

MR. GOODELL, EDITOR OF PRINCIPIA.—I send you a letter received this evening. I judge, from the closing sentence that the writer wishes it published.

My correspondent errs in supposing that I am in favor of a dissolution of the Union. I would have the states remain together, and the powers of the Federal Constitution carried out in the abolition of every portion of American Slavery. Nevertheless, if the Northern or Southern, Eastern or Western States wish to set up for themselves, I would let them do so, rather than have blood shed. The poorest remedy for evils that has yet been devised, is the shedding of blood.

GERRIT SMITH.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

I. Mr. Driver's belief that slavery is a divine institution, sanctioned by the Bible, is quite too stale and threadbare a pretense to excite much attention in these parts of the country. But, as the publication of his Letter, gives us our first, and probably, our last opportunity of speaking to him, we improve the opportunity of propounding to him, a few questions.

1. If you believe the Bible to be in favor of slavery, why don't you teach your slaves to read it, and put it into their hands, and let them read it, and all of it, *for themselves*?

2. When you teach them from the Scriptures "Servants, obey your masters"—do you read, in their hearing, likewise, "The laborer is worthy of his hire"—"Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal?"—"Woe unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work?"

3. The Bible says, "Search the Scriptures," "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." Do you allow and enable your slaves to do so? Do you teach them from the Bible "We ought to obey God rather than man." "If thou mayest be free, use it rather." "Be yet not the servants of men." "Call no man your master, on earth, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren?"

4. The Bible sanctions marriage, and forbids adultery and fornication. Can your slaves marry, and be protected in marriage, according to the Bible injunction, "Whom God hath joined together, let not man put asunder?"

5. The Bible says, "Honor thy father and thy mother," "Children obey your parents." How can slave children do this, when they are wholly under the control of their mas-

ters? Or how can their parents "train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," when they have no control over them, and may not teach them to read God's word, which you pretend to believe, sanctions slavery?*

6. What kind of civilization and Christianization is it that you have given to your slaves, while you will not allow them to live in the family relation, nor to read the word of God, for their religious instruction?

7. If they are Christians, and are members of your Churches, how dare you hold them in bondage as "Chattels personal," when Christ says, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me!" (See Matth. xxv.)

8. If the slaves are civilized and Christianized, why do you not accord to them the rights of a civilized and Christian people, the same rights that, as a civilized and Christian people (which you profess to be) you claim for yourselves? If they are men as you are, civilized, as you are, and Christians, as you are, why do you not treat them accordingly, and not as heathens, as savages, or rather as brute beasts, allowing them "no rights which a white man is bound to respect?" The Turks, being Mohammedans, hold no slaves who are of the same religion with themselves. Whenever a slave becomes a Mohammedan, he is liberated. Is there less of brotherly love and equality among your sort of Christians, than there is among the Mohammedan Turks?

II. The proposal of Mr. Driver, that abolitionists should assist ultra slaveholders in dissolving the Union.

We are opposed to it, on principle. God's command, in the Bible, is—"Execute judgment (justice) between a man and his neighbor." "Deliver him that is spoiled, out of the hand of the oppressor." "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." "Judges and officers shall thou make thee, in all thy gates, which the Lord thy God giveth the, throughout thy tribes, and they shall judge the people with just judgment." "For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil." "For he is the minister of God to thee, for good," "for he beareth not the sword, in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

Abraham Lincoln will not do this. Therefore radical abolitionists cannot vote for him. Nor can they consistently consent to a dissolution of the Union, so long as slavery is not abolished. Neither the law of Nature nor the law of Revelation gives them any warrant for doing so. The Bible, which abounds in exhortations and commandments to deliver the oppressed out of the hand of the oppressor, says not one word in favor of dividing a nation in two, leaving the oppressed at the mercy of the oppressors, or standing aloof, and "letting the two classes fight it out by themselves," as some have proposed. Neither would it be just or manly to do so. God holds nations responsible for all the oppressions committed within the nation. It is the duty of nations and of national governments, as well as states and state governments, to protect the natural rights of all men, and not suffer them to be violated, with impunity. The whole duty of civil government is the protection of equal rights, and when they fail in this, they fail in everything.

As the whole nation is responsible for, and guilty of, our great national sin of oppression, it is manifest that that responsibility cannot be thrown off, nor that guilt terminated nor diminished by dissolving the Union between the slave states and the free states, leaving the slaves in their chains.

Especially inconsistent and guilty would be the position of those abolitionists who should consent to this, believing, as we do, that the Federal Constitution not only warrants but requires a national abolition of slavery, being "ordained by the people of the United States," "to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity."

Let the nation first discharge this greatest, first duty, and then, if either "the Northern or Southern, the Eastern or the Western States wish to set up for themselves, we would let them go, rather than have blood shed." But we will not consent that either section shall go, with millions of our brothers and sisters in bondage! We remember how, when Gerrit Smith was candidate for Governor of New York, he said that, if he were Governor, and if the rendition of a

fugitive slave were demanded of him, he would see human blood flow like water, before he would give up a single black baby. Now we hold that the duty of the Nation toward its four millions of slaves is precisely the same as that of the State of New York toward a fugitive slave, and that the duty of deliverance, in the former case is, at least, as sacred as in the latter.

But as to the danger of blood-shed, to keep the South from seceding from the Union, we believe it to be all imaginary. The blood-shed, if any, would be to effect rather than to prevent disunion. And the struggle would be between the people of the South themselves, not between those of the North and the South. While we are writing, a Kentucky Breckinridge paper, the (Richmond) Mountain Democrat, comes to us, in which it is stated, that the only disunion paper in Georgia, is the Atlanta Democrat, a supporter of Douglas. The bluster about dissolving the Union might as well be discontinued. It deceives nobody, and "don't pay."

NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NUMBER IX.

Is the Nation responsible for slavery under a State Government?

In a former article* it was shown that the relation of slavery to its own State Government and its relation to the National Government were the same. We will only repeat here that neither a State Government nor the National Government *institutes* slavery by positive legislation. Its institution is the sole work of individuals, either in the absence of Government, or under its connivance. But when instituted, it is sustained by both the State Governments and the National Government, as slaveholders require. Its relation to both, therefore, is the same. Surely if the favor of State legislation, supported by the State judiciary, makes slavery a *State* institution, then the favor of National legislation, the National judiciary, and National diplomacy must quite as truly make it a *National* institution, for which the Nation is responsible. It will be hard to overthrow a proposition of such evidence.

With reference to our question, let us hear Mr. Sumner. In a late speech at the Cooper Institute, after describing the atrocious character of slavery, he said,

"Bad as it is, if it modestly kept at home, if it did not stalk into the National jurisdiction, and enter the National Government, *within the reach of our votes*, I should not summon you on this occasion, to unite against it, for whatever may be the promptings of sympathy and of godlike philanthropy, nothing is clearer than that our political duties depend upon our political responsibilities; and since we are not responsible for slavery in Charleston, or in Constantinople, so in neither place have we any political duties in regard to it."

It is hard to believe that such remarks are the result of Mr. Sumner's profoundest consideration. But we must copy a little more.

"Proud as we may be to tread where John Quincy Adams leads the way, there is a guide of more commanding authority found in the eternal laws of right, and in the concurring mandates of the Constitution itself."

Reader, please keep in mind the admission that the Constitution concurs with right.

Is our relation to slavery in Charleston the same, in Mr. Sumner's mind, as our relation to slavery in Constantinople? Would he say, in so many words, that slavery within our own National jurisdiction involves us in no responsibilities which we do not incur from slavery in another hemisphere? Suppose our Federal Government were politically obligated to sustain the Turkish Government against any rising of her oppressed people. Such an obligation, and nothing less, would bring slavery in Constantinople under the political parallel of Charleston. Would not the supposed obligation make it the "political duty" of our Government to compel the Turkish authorities to cease from oppressing the people, and administer government with protecting justice? It certainly would, unless we can be obligated to support tyranny. And he who has eyes to see that an obligation of injustice is impossible, will also see that an obligation to hold the people of Charleston in subjection to their State Government, is necessarily coupled with an obligation to hold the State Government itself in subjection to constitutional right. If every political orator

were compelled to explain, in his next speech, the right of one government to support the wrongs of another, the last political speech would become an ancient document before another would be delivered. And nobody would feel the impossibility of the task more than Mr. Sumner.

Not responsible for slavery in Charleston more than for slavery in Constantinople! Why, we could not abolish slavery in Constantinople, if we would, and we would not abolish it in Charleston, if we could. In the latter place we sanction and encourage it by our national example, in the Federal District. The same national spirit which would frown slavery away from the District, would put a speedy end to the slave trade between the States, and make slavery wither and die in them. If the Nation is not responsible for slavery in her own jurisdiction, where, except on a little knot of slaveholders, does the responsibility rest? In all or nearly all the slave States, the people are under the reign of terror, and can urge the abolition of slavery only at their peril. Unsupported by the national guaranty of republicanism and left to themselves, can it be expected that they will have more courage, firmness, and power against slavery in the States, than a great nation's representatives have against slavery in a paltry District? So long as we lack the will to abolish slavery, where we have unquestionable power to do it, and where its abolition would shake the whole system, let us take due shame. Our national guilt is essentially the same, whether we support a political system which requires a toleration of the worst outrages of humanity, or violate, for the sake of slavery, a Constitution concurring with "the eternal law of right."

An interference of bystanders just saved Mr. Sumner from being barbarously murdered. By what he is pleased to call "the eternal laws of right," that interference was a duty. Not to have performed the duty, would have been a disgraceful crime. Had the performance been prevented by a Constitutional prohibition, would not the murder have been chargeable upon the Nation? Could any enactment, called law, have excused bystanders in suffering the murder to be consummated? What would have been our judgment of them, had they stood and quietly remarked: "Nothing is clearer than that our individual duties depend upon our individual responsibilities; and since we are not individually responsible for this outrage, or for any similar outrage in Constantinople, so in neither place have we any individual duties in regard to it?"

Now, if by the eternal laws of right, interference and rescue were due to Mr. Sumner, are they not equally due, by the same laws, to more unfortunate victims of the same lawlessness that nearly murdered him? Is not society under a natural obligation to protect all its members not chargeable with crime? And is it not the work of government to enforce natural obligations, where they are not voluntarily discharged? Is not the Nation disgraced by recognizing, as State law, supported by State rights, enactments authorizing all the shameful wrongs which Mr. Sumner, with perfect justice, charges on slavery? If one government may interfere for the oppressed subjects of another, as is sometimes done, what estimate must be formed of our national magnanimity or justice, when we look on, and permit our own countrymen, subjects of our own government, to be ground down to the dust by State despotism; and this, too, under a Constitution concurring with "the eternal laws of right?"

We talk of the degradation of the slaves, but for that degradation they have no occasion to blush. When two governments hold you down and no friendly arm helps you up, you are deserving of neither censure nor contempt, if you do not rise. But there is a degradation both shameful and criminal. What ought we to think of a nation's degradation, when its spirit is such that a very small minority of despots, perhaps a hundredth part of the nation, can direct its movements to ends exactly the reverse of those which the Constitution proposes? To what is a nation sunk, when its political parties make a merit of not being Abolitionists, and dare not or will not propose abolition, where the nation's right to effect it is indisputable?

We have called the slaves subjects of our own government. Such they are, and that is different from being subjects of the Turkish government. A little more than a year ago, we had some account† of a case entitled "United States

* See The Principia of Feb. 25, 1860.

† See Sem. Weekly Tribune June 7, 1859.

vs. Amy," occurring in the eastern District of Virginia.

It appears that Amy was convicted, under the presiding of Judge Taney, of robbing the mail, and sentenced to imprisonment. Who was this Amy? She was a poor slave. The Federal Government had permitted her to be robbed all her life, but was ready to pounce upon her, the moment she committed robbery herself. We know not how many such cases may have occurred and passed into oblivion, as this has nearly done already. Nor do we know whether Amy's robbery was her voluntary act, or an act which she was compelled to perform by one who pretended to be her owner. But we do know, or at least believe, that people who may not rob, should be protected in their right to be honest. To the five great wrongs of slavery, described by Mr. Sumner, he might have added, for a sixth, that it visits upon its victims legal penalties without legal protection; or it makes them chattels when rights are affected, but responsible persons when punishment requires. He is too great a hater of slavery, we think, to be willing that the National Government should add the sixth wrong. But what preventive does a Constitution concurring with "the eternal laws of right" contain? Does it provide that slaves may freely rob the mail, or obstruct it, or destroy Federal property, or give "aid and comfort" to enemies, or violate any national law? No, it leaves them to be treated, in case of offense, just as if they were citizens of the *United States*, and *not* citizens of Constantinople. But how does it make Federal penalties consistent with justice? By providing personal securities for all honest men without regard to black or white, and making their personal securities a part of the supreme law of the land. A Constitution harmonizing with right, cannot demand allegiance of any from whom it withholds protection. It cannot authorize the punishment of a chattel, nor permit just laws to be violated with impunity.

Mr. Sumner regards the Constitution as concurring with right. If all the powers of his eloquence and political position were employed according to the logical leadings of this correct opinion, he would find himself a mighty co-worker with those humble men, called Radical Abolitionists, who are striving, against gigantic discouragements, to make the Nation see its duty, *not* of fixing a *limit*, but of putting an *end* to lawless outrage. It is to be wished that he would enlist, at least, for the overthrow of slavery in the District, where it is confessedly "within the reach of our votes." Thousands of hearts would leap to the support of the outraged man standing up for outraged humanity. In such an enterprize we want mighty men, of the spirit and unbending purpose of a Sharpe or a Wilberforce. We want men guided by a more far-seeing wisdom than that which is ever ready to buy present peace at the price of present right; men prompted by a principle far higher than the dollar motive which can enlist one against the *extension* of slavery, while it leaves all its outrages rampant about the National Capitol.

I. S.

NOVEL METHOD TO PREVENT POTATO ROT.—Some Belgian boys, a few years since, for amusement, inserted some peas into potatoes, and planted them. The result was an unusual yield of peas, and a crop of tubers perfectly sound, though in a field where the potatoes were badly affected. Acting on the hint, Mr. Jackson of Leeds, England, developed the theory that the potato, being deficient in nitrogen, would receive an equivalent of that article from the pea, during the time of growing, and so its tendency to disease would be counteracted. He then tried the experiment, inserting four or five peas in each potato, carefully avoiding injury to the eyes, and then planting in the usual way. The result was perfect success—an unusual yield of both peas and potatoes, and the latter perfectly free from disease. The tubers were found healthy the next spring, and were again planted with the same results.

It is computed that there are at least 200,000 smokers in the city of New York, who, upon an average, consume two cigars a day, making the total consumption of 400,000 per day. These, at an average cost of four cents each, will amount to \$16,000 daily consumed in this city alone. This makes \$5,840,000 annually.

The anti-tobacco journal of Rev. George Trask declares that the clergy of the United States cost annually \$6,000,000; the criminals \$19,000,000; the lawyers \$35,000,000; tobacco \$40,000,000 and rum \$100,000,000. The classification is rather an odd one, but the figures speak amazingly.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1860.

"UNNATURAL COALITIONS."

The Tribune, Aug 4, has a lecture editorial upon "unnatural coalitions"—and the disastrous results of them. There was, by the *Tribune's* account, "an unnatural coalition" between one Aaron Burr and the Federalists, to prevent the election of Jefferson in 1801, followed by the sudden downfall of Burr, and the ultimate ruin of the Federal party. Then came the coalition of De Witt Clinton, "an undoubted Republican" with the whole body of the Federalists, in 1813" against Mr. Madison, which cost Clinton his standing in the Republican party.—Then came the charge of a coalition between Adams and Clay, the imputation of which "carried them both to their graves."

In 1832, the Clay men, or National Republicans formed a coalition, with the Wirt-men, or Anti-Masons, for the common object of whipping out Jackson, and got whipped out, themselves. "In 1836 the antagonists of Van Buren were split into many factions, and agreed to run White, Harrison, Mangum, and Webster, in their several localities," and Van Buren beat the whole lot of them. "In 1848, Van Buren ran upon the Buffalo Platform, as a Free Soil Candidate" when his sole object was to punish Cass—afterward he deserted the Free Soilers, and the Democracy never forgave him.

The moral of all this, we suppose is, the wickedness and perdition of all the existing and possible "unnatural coalitions" against Lincoln, in 1860.

But why did the *Tribune* cut short its history of "unnatural coalitions," and the fate of them, without giving its readers the benefits of its own experience and reading, in a case more remarkable than either of those it has recorded in its lecture? Why did it not give us the paternity, history, and requiem, of its own idol and paragon, the great Whig party, originating in an "unnatural coalition" between the Nullifiers of the South, piloted by Calhoun, with the Protectionists of the North, by the help, if we misremember not, of James Watson Webb, for the sole object of killing Jackson, who had offended the one faction by putting down nullification, and the other, by consenting to compromise the Tariff? Why did it not tell us how this "unnatural coalition" continued during the life time of the Whig party, constituting its life blood,—how it kept up the flag of "protection" at the North, and of free trade at the South,—of National Bank at the North, and of Anti-Bank at the South—putting Harrison on its Presidential ticket, to catch the votes of the one wing, and Tyler on the same ticket, to catch the votes of the other,—and how the Northern wing got the worst of the bargain, by the death of Harrison and the accession of Tyler? Above all, why did not the *Tribune* relate the "unnatural coalition" of pro-slavery and anti-slavery in the Whig party—how it was recommended in the *Tribune*, as the "true Abolition party," and afterwards as the "true Free Soil party,"—while by its earlier opposition and more efficient mob-violence against abolitionists, it distanced its Democratic rival in gaining Southern favor, elected two Presidents on the merits of it, failed of electing another, and finally died the natural death of all "unnatural coalitions" in 1852?

Finally, why did not the *Tribune* tell us of its own influence in transferring to the service of the Republican party, the same tactics of "unnatural coalition" which had constituted the sum total of its political sagacity and capital as a Whig journal? Why did it fail to remind us how, in 1833 or 4, it expressed its willingness to drop the anti-slavery issue, as a *political* question, altogether, if (the Whig party being dead), it could get up, as it now seems to have done, another Tariff party? Why did it fail to remind us how the *Tribune* has done its best, not only to keep up an "unnatural coalition," between the anti-slavery, and pro-slavery (or conservative), elements of the Republican party, lowering down the former to the accommodation of the latter—but also favoring an "unnatural coalition" (if there be any essential difference between them) between the Republicans and the Douglas Democrats, in the Senatorial election

in Illinois, for the avowed purpose of electing Douglas instead of Lincoln, and the manifest prospect, not to say intention, of securing the Presidency for the former—and then following up its advocacy of the same policy in this Congressional district, and elsewhere, whenever the opportunity presented itself,—recommending also, in advance, the "unnatural coalition" between non-extensionists, or Republicans,—with Squatter Sovereignty, men, or Douglas Democrats, in the Crittenden Lecompton vote in Congress, for the adoption of a pro-slavery or an anti-slavery constitution for Kansas, as the popular vote in that Territory, under the hazards of pro-slavery violence and fraud, might chance to turn.

All the disastrous results of these "unnatural coalitions" between pro-slavery and anti-slavery, in the Whig, Free Soil, and Republican parties, the *Tribune* could not indeed have recorded in full, for they are not yet fully matured. But it might have told us that, already, they have been more dishonorable and more mischievous to the country, than all those other ones combined, which the *Tribune* undertook to record for the public benefit. Nothing but these "unnatural coalitions," have befooled the great body of anti-slavery voters for twenty years' past, inducing them to "throw away their votes" upon Clay, Harrison, Tyler, Taylor, Fillmore, Scott, Van Buren, Hale, and Fremont, (and now, if the *Tribune's* advice is followed, Lincoln likewise); when, by sticking to their own principles and candidates, instead of running into "unnatural coalitions," they might have preserved their own self-respect, the respect of their fellow citizens, and most probably might have elected their own candidate, four years ago. [S. P. Chase confessed, in 1852, that the Free Soil coalition under Van Buren and Hale, had proved a mistake, and that if abolitionists had remained in the Liberty party, supporting Birney, they would have been stronger in numbers and moral influence, than was the Free Soil party at that period.]

We heartily second the exhortation of the *Tribune* to beware of "unnatural coalitions." A more "unnatural coalition" never existed, than that between anti-slavery men and conservatives in 1860, in the Republican party. It may carry Lincoln into the Presidency, as it did Harrison and Tyler, and Taylor and Fillmore—with just as much benefit to the cause of freedom and humanity, and no more. And the ignominious downfall of the "coalition" Republican party, is as certain a *future* event, as the downfall of the "coalition" Whig party is a certain *past* event. Like moral cases never fail to produce like effects. A "coalition" party is never so near its overthrow, as when it has achieved a victory at the polls.

P. S.—Suppose the Presidential election should go into the House—Is the *Tribune* quite certain that it will not advocate an "unnatural coalition" with Douglas Democrats, in the way of choosing "the least of two evils" in such an emergency? Why not, the same as in the Illinois election, and in the Crittenden Lecompton struggle in Congress?

Why are Radical abolitionists derided by the *Tribune* as "impracticable?" Why, but because they refuse to join in any of the "unnatural coalitions" it is evermore commanding to them?

SLAVES are "CITIZENS"—TESTIMONY of JEFFERSON.

A correspondent inquires of us:

"I have noticed that you have twice stated that Jefferson called the slave 'citizens.' Will it be too much labor for you to refer to book and page?"

ANSWER. The expression occurs, if we mistake not, more than once, in the writings of Jefferson. For the present, we turn to our copy of a volume entitled, "LEGION OF LIBERTY," consisting of extracts from a great variety of authors, against slavery, published by the American Anti-Slavery Society—a revised and enlarged edition—in 1857. On page 23, under the name of JEFFERSON, is found that memorable paragraph, commencing:

"The whole commerce between master and slave, is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading subjection on the other"—and closing with,

"The Almighty has no attributes that could take sides with us in such a contest."

It is in this same paragraph, about mid-way between these two memorable sentences, that another, not less worthy of remembrance occurs, as follows:

electing Douglas in prospect, not to say in the former—and then the policy in this Convention never the opportunity also, in advance, the Unionists, or Republicans, or Douglas Democrats in Congress, for theavery constitution for territory, under the hazard, might chance to

unnatural coalitions" in the Whig, Free State could not indeed, but yet fully matured. Ready, they have beenrous to the country, which the Tribune understand. Nothing but these the great body of anti-slavery, inducing them to Garrison, Tyler, Tayor, and Fremont, (and Lincoln likewise), peoples and candidates, lititions," they might the respect of their that have elected their Chase confessed, in der Van Buren and if abolitionists had voting Birney, they and moral influence, riad.]

the Tribune to be more "unnatural" in an anti-slavery menican party. It may it did Garrison and just as much benefit and no more. And on" Republican parwnfall of the "coalition." Like moral cases "coalition" party is has achieved a vic

tion should go into that it will not ad Douglas Democrats, evils" in such an the Illinois election, ggle in Congress? by the Tribune as ey refuse to join in vermore commend

of JEFFERSON.

ated that Jefferson o much labor for

we mistake not, on. For the presitled, "LEGION of great variety of au merican Anti-Sla sation—in 1857. On s found that mem

and slave, is a passions, the most d degrading sub

could take sides

mid-way between her, not less wor

"And with what execration should the statesman be load-ed, who permitting one half of the CITIZENS, thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the amor patriæ of the other."

Letter to M. Warville, Paris, Feb. 1788.

By thus speaking of the slaveholders, or of the white population as "one half of the citizens," and of the slaves as "the other" half, Mr. Jefferson very emphatically affirms the equal citizenship of the latter with the former.

NOTICE.

WEDNESDAY 29th of AUGUST, is the time finally agreed upon for holding the RADICAL ABOLITION CONVENTION at Syracuse.

The Convention will meet at 10 o'clock, A. M., to nominate candidates for President and Vice President of the United States; also to nominate candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor of this State.

The men and women of this, and other States, who occupy radical positions in Anti-Slavery and Temperance, are earnestly invited to attend, and take part in this convention.

W. W. CHAPMAN,
J. C. HARRINGTON,
OTIS SIMMONS. { Central Committee.

MINETTO, N. Y. July 5th, 1860.

We cordially concur in the above call for a Convention; and we hope it will be attended by hundreds of earnest men and women.

We believe in a religion of justice and mercy, and we cannot consent to apostatize from it, at the ballot-box, more than elsewhere.

We believe that man was made to love God and his fellow man, and we cannot consent to trample upon beautiful and glorious human nature at the ballot-box more than elsewhere.

These being our beliefs, we sternly refuse to vote for candidates who are opposed to or pressing the dramshop, that most prolific source of degradation and danger to man and of blasphemous insults to God.

So do we refuse to vote for candidates who would send back to slavery the brother or sister who had escaped from that hell of horrors. So do we refuse to vote for candidates who would make the social, civil, or political right of one variety of human family even a hair's-breadth less than those enjoyed by another.

So in short do we refuse to vote for any candidate who would recognize a law for slavery, any more than a law for murder.

Signed.

ONTARIO Co., N. Y.—J. W. Duffin, George Lincoln, Samuel Crandall, George T. Fisher.

ONONDAGA Co., N. Y.—John P. Belker, T. G. White, M. Merrick, Charles Merrick, William Cooper, C. D. B. Mills.

WYOMING Co.—R. W. Lyman, L. P. Frost, H. M. Waldo, F. B. Bushnell, O. Hitchcock.

FULTON Co.—A. S. Leaton, Rensselaer Livingston, Wm. M. Harris.

MADISON Co.—Samuel Breese, Otis Simmons, Gerrit S. Simmons, Horace Simmons, Lafayette Simmons, Ezra Campbell, Ezra Campbell Jr., Otis Campbell, Gerrit Smith, Horace Stowell, A. Lewis, Geo. W. Putnam, Noah Tyler, Charles Lewis, Albert Lewis, Caleb Calkins, George Lewis, Silas T. Fyler, James Ferguson, Silas Keller, Silas B. Fyler, Joseph Fancher, Wm. A. Babcock, John A. Foster, Pixley Curtis, Benj. F. Remington.

OSWEGO Co.—John B. Edwards, Hamilton Littlefield, Hiram Gilbert, Andrus Gilbert, Jacob Kendall.

LEWIS Co.—Olney Place, S. H. Taft.

JEFFERSON Co.—Joseph Osborn.

CAYUGA Co.—Henry Collins, Archibald Green, John Mitchel, John W. Sawyer, Abner A. Armstrong.

CORTLAND Co.—Victor Kingsley, Luther Wellington, M. I. Palmer, Cyrus P. Grosvenor, Silas Hammond.

CATTARAUGAS Co.—Wm. Shattuck, Sylvester Caswell, Otis Hitchcock, Truman Hitchcock, David Strong, Darius Bowing, Timothy Everit, Alvan Plumley, Solomon Nichols, Frederick Dexter, Franklin Nichols, Numan Nichols, Phineas Noble, Nelson Boardman.

HERKIMER Co.—Edwin Pratt, Truman Cole, L. D. Metcalf, Zenas Brockett, Josiah Rice.

BROOME Co.—Charles A. Hammond.

ONEIDA Co.—Ira Hills, G. L. Brockett, Wm. Lawson, Charles Lawson, I. K. Casterton, Manley M. Hills, Geo. W. Bronson, Ira Hills, Scrope Moses, Seeley Hills.

KNOX Co., OHIO.—Rev. T. B. Dawson, Robert Dawson, R. Welsh, R. W. Welsh, John Boyd, Henry Chandler, S. B. Dodd, M. D., W. P. Pierson, Rev. Joseph Whitham, S. B. Cline, Joseph A. McFarland.

OHIO.—W. A. Hunter, Rev. John Petitt, A. Ames, Rev. C. A. Hoyt, Wm. N. Hudson, John Frost, N. H. Townsend, Rev. S. T. Boyd, A. Beecher, Rev. T. B. McCormick.

GUERNSEY Co., OHIO. I. H. Dilley, Martin Hays, I. H. Wallar, Eleazar Thompson, Thos. B. Crusen, Andrew Haslet, J. H. Webster, John Rainie, John Morrison, J. C. Hickman, I. W. Umstat, T. C. Morrison, Gamaliel Thompson.

son, Jas. H. Thompson, L. S. Thompson, Robert Thompson, R. Lowrey.

INDIANA.—Rev. L. Wilson, Rev. George Ritchery.

MICHIGAN.—John Lowery.

WASHINGTON Co., PENN.—George Buchanan, E. T. A. new, Samuel McFarland, James P. Welsh.

ILLINOIS.—J. W. Mahan, Rev. Geo. W. Bassett.

VIRGINIA.—George Whitham, Peregrine Whitham.

commend Congress to repeal that "deliberate, dangerous, and palpable usurpation of undelegated power, commonly termed the Fugitive Slave Law."

2d. Will you, under the plain, positive and specific grant of power, "To regulate commerce among the several States," recommend Congress to prohibit, by law, the interstate slave trade?

3d. As the Federal Constitution expressly delegates to Congress the right "To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over the District of Columbia," will you recommend Congress to abolish and prohibit slavery in that Territory?

4th. Will you recommend Congress to enact a law, defining what shall constitute a contempt of either House, and to protect the citizens from being immured to rot in a "Republican Bastile"?

A usurpation of power, infinitely more dangerous to liberty, than any that has preceded it is now, it is to be feared, in a successful tide of experiment. The Senate in committing Mr. Hyatt for an alleged contempt has, beyond all question, transcended its powers, and established a precedent which, if not met and resisted by the Sovereign States, will subject their citizens, for all time, to a despotism, compared with which, the atrocious Sedition law of 1798, dwindles into absolute insignificance. This usurpation, like the "Sedition law," can be defended upon no possible plea, but that the "common law" of England, is in full force and vigor in this Union.

Yours truly, B. G. WRIGHT.

To Hon. A. Lincoln.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill., June 8th, 1860.

B. G. WRIGHT, Esq.

Dear Sir:—Your letter to Hon. A. Lincoln, of May 28th and by which you seek to obtain his opinion on certain political points, has been received.

He has received others of a similar character; but also a greater number of the exactly opposite character. The latter class beseech him to write nothing whatever upon any point of political doctrine. They say his positions were well known when he was nominated, and that he *must* not now embarrass the canvass by undertaking to shift or modify them. He regrets that he cannot oblige all, but you perceive that it is impossible for him to do so.

Yours truly, JNO. G. NICHOLAS.

In conclusion, my Republican friends, I am sorry to part company with you in the coming canvass, but the non-committalism of Hon. A. Lincoln makes it an imperative duty. Mr. Lincoln's right to pursue this policy is not questioned, but I do question its correctness, because it essentially subverts our representative system of Government, and makes it a mere sham not worth the cost of its administration.

Respectfully your fellow citizen, B. G. WRIGHT.

CHURCH-ACTION.

We invite special attention to the following action of the Plymouth Church and congregation at Syracuse, N. Y., as presenting a refreshing contrast to the timid policy and ambiguous language of certain ecclesiastical bodies, on the slavery question—a specimen of the Church action that is needed, to liberate the enslaved, and to preserve civil and religious liberty in America—a specimen, moreover, of the Church action that would be extensively and spontaneously taken all over the free States, if the pastors of churches would faithfully discharge their duty. These resolutions breathe the spirit of Luther, of John Knox, and of the churches of New England, in 1776.

At a meeting of Plymouth Church and Society, in Syracuse, (N. Y.) August 5th, 1860, the following resolutions were reported by a committee and adopted as the sentiments of the church and congregation:

Resolved, That the fugitive slave laws of 1793 and 1850, in their claims to chattelize the image of God in the person of his downtrodden poor, and the claim of vested property rights in the same, are the greatest falsehoods on earth, not only brutalizing man, and stripping him of his manhood, but insulting the blessed Father, God, in the attempt to rob him of his Fatherhood of the human family, for he declares most emphatically that he created man in his own image, and that he hath made of one blood, all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth.

Resolved, That we hail with gratitude, the recent providential deliverance wrought for S. M. Booth, of Milwaukee, by the hand of ten noble men, who were willing to act out their manhood in behalf of a persecuted fellow citizen, after being denied all hope of present deliverance from the State Courts of Wisconsin.

Resolved, That the action of the General Government, to override the sovereignty of each State, in its rights to protect its own citizens in their natural rights to liberty, is an alarming assumption of despotic power, that calls for the severest reprobation, and the most decided resistance from every liberty-loving citizen in the land.

Resolved, That until a much larger portion of the American Ministry, Church and Press, not only theorize, but shall act on their individual and combined responsibilities, and everywhere declare chattel slavery to be a piracy and an outlaw, and shall deny it any vested, legal, social or church

News of the Day.

"HONEST ABE LINCOLN"—NON-COMMITAL—DECIDES ANSWERING!

While Republican committees and leading journals, are circulating Lincoln's debates with Douglas, in 1858, as containing a true expose of his principles and measures, not a few anti-slavery Republicans, are annoyed with such a "campaign document," and are trying to persuade themselves and others, that *perhaps* his views are not quite as objectionable, now, as when he debated with Douglas. At that time he denied being in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law, declared his belief that the Southern States were entitled to have one in some form; and added that though the present law was "not free from some objections," which might have been obviated in framing, "without lessening its efficiency," yet he, (Lincoln,) "would not be the man to introduce it," (a proposed change,) as a new subject of agitation &c. Further, he was not pledged against the admission of new slave States, and did not see how, if such a State offered itself, it could be excluded. Neither was he pledged to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, nor could he consent to it, unless it were gradual, with consent of the majority of the voters, and with compensation to such of them as were unwilling to emancipate.

The question has been presented—*Are these the present views of Abraham Lincoln?*

In order to satisfy himself on this point, Mr. B. G. Wright of Rural, (Ill.) a gentleman who has long been known to us, addressed to Mr. Lincoln a letter, which we re-publish from the Rock Island, (Ill.) Weekly Register, a Republican paper, where it is introduced by a letter addressed by Mr. B. G. Wright, and commencing as follows:

"TO THE REPUBLICANS OF 1860.

"Fellow Citizens: As it would be a violation of moral principle in me, to vote for your nominee for President and Vice President, let me frankly give you the reasons for my withdrawal from your party.

"It is conceded that every man owes fealty to his party, but he is not bound to sacrifice principle in his devotion to any organization."

After discussing the subject at some length, Mr. Wright says:

"Some of my republican friends having assured me that their nominees were "sound on" the anti-slavery side of "the goose," and others, that they had no other object in view, as regards slavery, than to keep it out of the Territories, I addressed a letter of inquiry to Hon. A. Lincoln, which, with the reply, is appended.

"In the following letter to Hon. A. Lincoln, my sole object was to acquire such information as would enable me conscientiously to give him my vote, for the exalted position to which he aspires, and which no man can reach without the consent of the requisite number of his fellow citizens. And that this consent should be based on a thorough knowledge of the political principles by which the aspirant intends to be governed, in the exercise of the highly important "trust powers" confided to him, will not, I think, be doubted by any one, who believes that all power emanates from the people. And that we should be extremely cautious in making this choice, is equally true, because the acts of the *representative* are, in fact, the acts of his *constituents* whose votes place him in power, and for whose acts they are, beyond all question, accountable to God and their country. If the people know what course Mr. Lincoln will adopt on the very highly important question asked in my letter, they know more than I do. Even his friends do not agree in their statements to me, of what his course will be; but they are willing to take him upon trust, and risk their accountability to God, their country and posterity, for all his acts. This, my fellow citizens, is the difference between us—hence the following letter;

RURAL, Ill., May 28th, 1860.

DEAR SIR:—Anxious to vote understandingly for President, I address you, in good faith, the following questions, trusting that they will be frankly answered.

1st. Will you, if elected President, take your stand upon the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798, against the Alien and Sedition laws, and to remove all danger of collision between the Federal and State Governments, re-

rights, so long will it demand legal protection, social regard and ecclesiastical position, and with a compromising christianity, and a spurious political action, it will continue to eat like a cancer upon all our religious and civil institutions.

Resolved, That to a faithful witnessing christianity, and a more direct and faithful application of the great truths of the Declaration of Independence, ultimate triumph is sure in this warfare against oppression.

Resolved, That we also hereby tender our warmest sympathies and prayers to all the persecuted brethren and sisters who have been driven out from their labors and homes in Kentucky, and also for the Rev. D. Worth, of North Carolina, a colporteur of the American Missionary Association, and now under bonds for the truth's sake, in behalf of the poor oppressed ones of our land.

MOVING AT THE WEST.

The Prairie Home, Sandwich, (Ill.) contains the proceedings of a meeting of Radical Abolitionists held there, Aug. 2d. S. Lay was appointed Chairman, and J. Mattison Secretary. The following resolutions were adopted, and a letter from the meeting was addressed to the Nominating Convention to be held at Syracuse, N. Y., the 29th inst.

RESOLUTIONS.

1st. Resolved; That chattel slavery, as it is sanctioned by our National Government, is consummately shameful, and infinitely wicked.

2nd. That the God of Heaven, in justice, requires its immediate abolition throughout all our borders, by the government of this nation.

3d. That entire obedience to God, in this matter, is the only safe and wise policy of government and political action, and nought but sheer infidelity, and the spoils of defeated parties, give rise to any fear of consequences, or any possible objection to this course of action.

4th. That the Constitution of the United States demands what God requires, or according to the best standard legal writers, it can have no more binding force than rules and regulations adopted by a band of pirates: If then, slavery and the "Fugitive Slave Law" are constitutional, we declare in the fear of Him who holds the destiny of nations in his hands, and who infinitely abhors oppression, that these things must be made right, or there is no *Law* or political policy that can hold this nation together one moment longer than is necessary to fill up its measure of iniquity.

Therefore, Resolved, 5th, That in the present contest for President and Vice President, the people are bound to nominate candidates that they know to be right on this subject.

6th. That as the leading political parties have selected candidates that concede to the States a right to hold slaves, and pledge themselves thus to execute the horrid "Fugitive Slave Law," we cannot and will not give them our votes at the next Presidential election, preferring to act with the only Liberty Party, whose nominating convention is to be held at Syracuse, Aug. 29th inst.

MR. BOOTH AT RIPON.

A DEPUTY MARSHAL ATTEMPTS TO ARREST HIM!—FINDS IT WARM WORK, AND IS GLAD TO GET AWAY!!

WAUPUN, August 6.—Report by this morning's train says Booth lectured at Ripon, Saturday evening, and announced that there was a marshal in the room, and wished him to come forward and take him. Deputy McCarty, of Fond du Lac, stepped forward and presented a writ.—Immediately, about a hundred cried out, "Kill him!—Hustle him out!" McCarty had his clothing torn off. No shots were fired although revolvers, knives, &c., were handled carelessly.—Mr. Booth lectured in the grove Sunday—flags flying; great excitement, but no more attempts to arrest up to this morning.—*Wis. Free Dem.*

The following reaches us through the Fond-du-lac Commonwealth of Aug. 8.

The People Organized to Defend State Rights:

[From the Ripon Times Extra.]

RIPON, August 5, 1860.

S. M. Booth arrived in this city on Saturday morning, under an armed escort from Waupun. Notice that he would speak at the City Hall in the evening was sent out, and at the appointed time a large audience crammed the Hall to its utmost capacity, while some hundreds in the streets were unable to gain admittance.

The meeting was called to order by C. J. Allen, when Wm. Starr was chosen Chairman, and Mr. Allen Secretary. Mr. Booth was introduced to the audience, and was greeted with hearty applause, and bouquets were thrown upon the platform by several ladies.

Mr. Booth had proceeded for some time with his speech, when Deputy Marshal F. D. McCarty of Fond du Lac, suddenly came on the Platform and said "I have a warrant to arrest you, Mr. Booth." He barely succeeded in putting one hand on Mr. Booth when he was instantly pulled away by the bystanders. A scene of intense excitement and indescribable confusion followed. "Kill him," "shoot him,"

"hang him," went up in shouts from all parts of the Hall. McCarty was thrust out of the hall by the enraged people, being kicked and beaten by his pursuers, and was thrown down the lower flight of stairs, falling upon his face. Instantly regaining his feet he fled to the Mapes House, followed by the crowd in pursuit. The Mapes House was the head-quarters of the Marshal and his friends, and they appeared at the door armed and forbade entrance to the pursuers.

At the Hall, as soon as order could be restored, a resolution was offered by E. A. Bovay,—"Resolved, That Mr. Booth shall not be re-arrested in Ripon,"—which was adopted amid deafening shouts and hurrahs. Mr. Daniels took the stand and made an impassioned speech for a few minutes, and moved that we now organize a *League of Freedom*, the members of which shall be pledged to resist any attempt to execute the Fugitive Slave Act. One hundred and twenty persons were enrolled as fast as the names could be written. E. A. Bovay was elected President, and C. J. Allen, Secretary. A Vigilance Committee of twelve members was appointed, consisting of Edward Daniels, O. H. LaGrange, A. B. Pratt, Danna Lamb, A. E. Bovay, C. D. Loper, J. S. Landon, F. R. Stewart, I. A. Norton, F. W. Cooke, Lucius Thacher, A. M. May, Benjamin Pratt, L. P. Rivenburgh. The mass of the people then formed a procession, proceeded by the Ripon Wide Awakes, and escorted Mr. Booth to the residence of Prof. Daniels. Some twelve or fifteen persons were put on volunteer guards, to defend the residence of Prof. Daniels, and the remainder dispersed.

The Vigilance committee held a meeting this morning and took measures to effect a Military organization to subserve the purpose of the League.

To-day the people have been pouring in from the country, and at three o'clock a mass meeting was held in a grove. Col. A. Kinney was called to the chair, and C. J. Allen appointed Secretary. A Committee consisting of Edward Daniels, A. Pickett, C. J. Allen, J. W. Sanders, I. A. Norton, P. F. Drury, and F. Burt was appointed to prepare resolutions. Mr. Booth then addressed the meeting. After which M. LaGrange was called out and spoke for a short time. Mr. Daniels reported from the Committee a series of resolutions, which were adopted unanimously. A procession then formed and marched to the City Hall—Mr. Booth going to the Hall as he had gone to the grove, escorted by a body of armed men. The Hall was taken possession of, and guards stationed for its defence.

At the Hall, a committee of ten was appointed to wait upon the Deputy Marshalls here, and request them to leave town.—Messrs. William Starr, A. E. Bovay, E. Reynolds, C. J. Allen, I. A. Norton, F. A. Strong, F. R. Stewart, L. D. Rivenburgh, A. Pratt, and A. Leonard, were appointed such committee, who repaired to the Mapes House, and had an interview with Deputy Marshals McCarty, Henry, Stryker, and Garlick.—Mr. Starr conveyed to them the request of the meeting, and received from them answer, that they were U. S. officers, that they had in their possession a warrant for the arrest of S. M. Booth, and they should depart when such departure was consistent with the performance of their duties.

While the committee and Marshals were in conference, Rev. Hiram McKee addressed a large concourse of people in the street.

At this writing, the streets are crowded with excited people, and Mr. Booth is strongly guarded at the Hall, to which only known friends are admitted.

Monday Morning.

Comparative order and quiet reign this morning. The City Hall is vacant. Mr. Booth has gone—where, the public do not know—report says he on his way to Milwaukee,—that he left town about 11 o'clock last night—and two Deputy Marshals are in pursuit.

EXCITEMENT IN TEXAS.

There is a great excitement in Texas, on account of supposed insurrectionary plots of negroes and abolitionists. Several persons have been hung on suspicion, and vigilance committees have been formed. The papers abound in such statements as the following:

A letter of the 21st ult., from Dallas, Texas, to the Austin State *Gazette*, says:

"The excitement consequent upon the revelations made by negroes under examination, continues unabated. Already nearly a hundred blacks have been arrested and examined separately before a Committee of Vigilance, appointed for that purpose. This Committee consists of the most respectable and responsible gentlemen of this country, whose proceedings have been characterized by the utmost prudence and moderation. Crowds of men are in Dallas, anxious and eager to lend their assistance, and ready to quell every disturbance that threatens the peace of the State. The developments are of the most startling character, unfolding the most diabolical plot that the wickedness of man could invent, to destroy this whole section of country. At the town of Lancaster the same general plot was revealed—to burn the town; to poison the inhabitants; to assassinate the aged females, and to seize and appropriate the young and handsome for their villainous purposes.

MONDAY, July 22.—An immense concourse of people is here awaiting the action of the Committee of vigilance. The stage came in from Wazahatchie yesterday, bringing

news of the high state of excitement in that town. The conspiracy and insurrectionary spirit extend to that place in all the horrid forms contemplated at this place. Throughout the country, so far as we can learn, the same thing exists. That town was destined to be burned, the people to be poisoned and slaughtered, and the remaining property to be distributed among the victorious blacks. On Red Oak Creek, the chief prisoner has been arrested and executed. Negroes at Wazahatchie have been detected with the poison in their possession; and a runner in town yesterday reports that there have been several executions at that place. We have not yet received the particulars. The Committee of Vigilance have been in session all day, and this evening they announced that three of the ringleaders of the insurrection are to be hanged to-morrow.

TUESDAY, July 24.—This evening, at 4 o'clock, the three ringleaders, Sam, Cato, and Patrick, were escorted from the jail, under a strong guard, to the place of execution. An immense concourse of citizens and negroes assembled. As they passed through the town, they surveyed with compunction the ruins of the once flourishing town that now lay a blackened mass before them. Patrick remained calm and collected during the whole day, and betrayed no remorse or feeling whatever in view of his approaching doom. He it was who fired the town, and the night after its destruction glorified himself for the deed, and pronounced it only the commencement of the good work. Sam Smith, so called from the name of his master, was an old negro preacher, who had imbibed most of his villainous principles from two Abolition preachers, Blunt and McKinney, who lived in the county a year before, and had much intercourse with him. Cato had always enjoyed a bad reputation. They met their fate with a composure worthy of a better cause. Patrick, with unparalleled *nonchalance*, died with a chew of tobacco in his mouth, and refused to make any statement whatever. They were hung on the bank of the river, above town, and are buried beneath the gallows. Investigations are still going on throughout the country, all of which tend to confirm the facts elicited at this place. The evidence obtained before the Committee will be published in due time.

The *Houston True Southerner*, of the 28th, says:

Just as we are going to press news has arrived here from a reliable source that 22 negroes have been arrested and are to be hung in Wazahatchie to-day.

Our fellow-citizen, Mr. H. L. Cotton, informs that a letter was received by Thursday mail, by his niece in this place, from Mrs. Bennet, of Austin, giving an account of a fearful attempt made about the 22d inst., to reduce the State capitol to a heap of ashes. The daring experiment was made to set fire to some twenty-five of the principal edifices of the city; fortunately, however, the flames were discovered and extinguished, before an serious damage had been sustained. On the night previous, the Austin correspondent to whom we are indebted for the intelligence we are recording, had been keeping vigils over the sick bed of a friend, when she observed a sheet of flame bursting from a neighboring house, which in consequence of timely warning, the citizens were enabled to arrest, and save the building from impending ruin.

At present, says Mr. Bennet, the whole population of the Metropolis are under arms, and laboring under the most intense excitement. A police force, consisting of from sixty to ninety men, are maintaining the strictest system of vigilance, by night and by day.

The *Galveston News* of the 2d, has the following:

"A young gentleman just from Huntsville, informed the *Anderson Texian* of the 28th ult., that the citizens of Walker County were to hold a meeting that day to consider the exigencies of the times, growing out of the Dalles disturbance. A night patrol is kept up, and the greatest watchfulness exercised.

The same paper learns from a private source that an attempt was made during the week to fire the town of Brenham. Abolition emissaries were supposed to be at the bottom of it. A public meeting was held at Brenham on Thursday, 26th ult., to consider the matter, and to take such steps as the exigencies of the case might seem to demand.

The citizens of Grimes County held a public meeting on the 26th July at Anderson, Hon Geo. M. Patrick presiding. Addresses were delivered by J. W. Hutchenson, Esq., Rev. G. W. Baines, H. McDaniel and others.

Resolutions were passed to the effect that there is among the negroes in the county a disposition to revolt and be insubordinate; that this feeling is produced by the influence of certain white persons in the county; that it is time steps be taken to rid the community of these men; that preaching to the negroes in the county be stopped, at least for one year; that Northerners coming into the county under pretence of being ministers, teachers, drummers, etc., are to be regarded with suspicion and received with caution that a Vigilance Committee be appointed, patrols organized, and other measures for safety be taken.

[The spirit of these resolutions is deserving of consideration and imitation in all the counties of the State.—*Eds. News.*]

At Hempstead, a public meeting was held on the 26th, with similar objects to the Anderson meeting. Similar precautions have been taken in Wood Co., and a Vigilance Committee and patrol appointed for the town of Uitman, where an attempt was made on the night of the 20th to fire one of the stores. The incendiary was fired at, but escaped.

At Paris, Lamar County, a meeting was held on the 20th,

own. The
that place
Through-
one thing
people to be
erty to be
Red Oak
executed.
the poison
ay reports
lace. - We
mittee of
ening they
surrection

the three
d from the
tion. An
bled. As
h compo-
ow lay a
calm and
emorse or
n. He it
struction
only the
so called
preacher,
from two
ved in the
with him
met their

Patrick,
of tobacco
whatever
own, and
s are still
d to con-
obtained
e.

here from
d and are

at a let-
e in this
ount of a
duce the
periment
principal
nes were
age had
a corres-
ence we
k bed of
ng from
y warn-
e build-

ation of
the most
om sixty
of vigi-

med the
of Wal-
sider the
distrub-
watchful-

at an at-
of Bren-
the bot-
n Thurs-
ch steps

ting on
esiding
q., Rev.

among
l be in-
fluence
the steps
reaching
for one
lder pre-
re to be
that a
ized, and

nsidera-
—Eds.

the 26th.
ilar pre-
gilation
uitman,
h to fire
escaped.
the 20th,

at which various precautionary measures were adopted. Judge Buford, of Dallas, writes to the *Waco Democrat* from Waxahatchie, Ellis County, confirming the previous accounts of the thorough organization of nearly all the negroes of Ellis and the adjoining counties, originated and superintended by white men, and having for its object an indiscriminate massacre of the white population.

DEATH OF REV. NOAH EMERSON.

This venerable minister of Christ, long a resident of Hollis, N. H., died at the Reservation of the Shinnecock Indians, in the town of Southampton, Long Island, July 9, 1860. Early last winter he became deeply interested in the remnant of this tribe of Indians, and corresponded with us in relation to his laboring as a missionary among them. He commenced his labors there early in May, and continued them till the day of his death, preaching three times and holding a Bible class on the Sabbath, and visiting the people at their homes during the week. He preached twice and held his Bible class as usual July 8th, and expected to have preached a third time, at 5 o'clock, but immediately after the services of the Bible class, he was seized with paralysis, and was immediately taken to his lodgings. Every thing that the skill of the physician and the ministrations of kind friends could do, was in vain. Without any apparent recovery of consciousness, he died about half past twelve o'clock that night.

The relations of this much esteemed brother to our Association were peculiar. He wished to co-operate with us, and desired that his labors should be under the supervision of our Executive Committee, and subject to its approval, but he expressly stipulated, "without pay." When he might have claimed exemption from labor on account of infirmity, his labors were volunteered to the little church to which he ministered; to which, and to the whole community, he greatly endeared himself by his labors of love. His funeral sermon was preached by the Rev. W. N. Cleveland, from the very appropriate text; *Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord. Yea saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them.*

We expect to refer again to the relations of Mr. Emerson to the Association, especially with respect to his purposes of aiding it with a portion of his property.—*American Missionary.*

We think it proper to add that Mr. Emerson was an earnest abolitionist, of the radical stamp, a firm believer in the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and in the duty and practicability of a National abolition of slavery, under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. He was a prompt paying subscriber, (always in advance,) to the "Radical Abolitionist," and the "Principia," and his letters to the Editor bear testimony to the thoroughness of his perusal of them, and his hearty concurrence in the principles and measures advocated by them. He was one among the many scores of aged, godly men, the survivors of a former generation, to whom our humble labors have been acceptable, and by whose direct aid and encouraging words, our labors have been sustained and cheered. A few of them still remain.—*Ed. Prin.*

EUROPE.

The steamship *Adriatic*, from Havre and Southampton, on the 1st inst., brings advices four days later. The most important feature in the news, is a letter on the state of Europe, from the Emperor Napoleon to the Count De Persigny, French Ambassador to the Court of London. On the two great leading topics of the day, the Emperor gives it, as his "innermost thought," that he desires peace for Italy, without foreign intervention, and wishes to undertake the Syrian Expedition in conjunction with other Powers. Particulars are received of the two actions fought on the 20th and 21st inst. at Melazzo, in which the Garibaldians were perfectly successful. Garibaldi has entered Messina, and has concluded a military convention with the Neapolitan commander. It is confirmed that the General has refused to grant the truce asked for by the King of Sardinia, and that he expresses a firm intention to march upon Naples as soon as he has taken Messina. We have details of the massacre of Christians in Damascus. The accounts give the number of victims at three or four thousand. It was fully expected that a convention of the Great Powers, with regard to the Syrian question, would be signed on the 1st. inst., and that immediately afterwards, an embarkation of a

combined Russian, French, and English expedition would take place.

The steamship *Anglo-Saxon*, from Liverpool on the 2d inst., via Londonderry on the 3d, brings news two days later. A convention had been signed at Messina, between Gen. Clary, on the part of the King of Naples, and Col. Mediti for Garibaldi, in which it was agreed that Sicily should be evacuated by the Neapolitans—from motives of humanity. The convention, the text of which is published by the Paris *Moniteur*, is solely of a military character. The losses of Garibaldi, at the taking of Melazzo, are put down at one thousand men, principally among his best corps. The Great Powers have agreed upon the conditions of a European intervention in Syria, and a conference of their respective representatives was to assemble at Paris, on the afternoon of Friday, the 3d inst., to sign a convention in reference to the measures to be taken in common. The question of the paper duty in Parliament, was still being agitated, but it was considered improbable that the Palmerston Ministry would either dissolve or resign, if defeated. The English funds are reported firm, with an increased demand for discounts. The Liverpool cotton market was firmer and more active, but with unchanged prices.—*Times.*

By the Persia and Panama, Liverpool news is received to 5th inst. The chief items are—Large accessions to Garibaldi—Volunteers in Calabria—He is about to advance on Naples—The people of Naples and Rome call him—Complete success of Garibaldi in Sicily—Evacuation of Sicily by the Neapolitans—Preparations for the invasion of Naples—The European intervention in Syria.—&c.

DR. CHEEVER IN LONDON.—At a public meeting in London, August 1, to celebrate W. I. Emancipation, Dr. Cheever was enthusiastically received, and made an eloquent speech, upon the Anti-Slavery struggle in America. He resumed his seat amid great applause.

INFAMOUS AFFAIR

Three free negroes were kidnapped in Iroquois county, Illinois, the other day, in the most open manner, and the outrage consummated with circumstances of violence and defiance of law unparalleled within our knowledge. The story is told as follows:

On the Sabbath they (the kidnappers) met at the house of John O'Neal, about three fourths of a mile west of Clifton, procured a team and placed sentinels along the road and in and about Ashkum. On the afternoon of that day George D. Smith went into the village and procured a room. He then went out and enticed the unsuspecting five negro men into this place, and called for, and was supplied with whisky and cards. At the appointed time he made a preconcerted signal, when the whole company came up, surrounded, and entered the house with knives and revolvers, and attempted to take the negroes and fetter them. A general fight ensued, several of the negroes fighting desperately and two made their escape. The other three, Slater, who leaves a wife, and who is a free negro from Boston, John, from Maryland, and William, a little boy from Florida, were finally subdued and tied. They were immediately put into a lumber wagon in waiting and run under the whip to Ashkum.

The alarm being given in and about Clifton, all the best citizens of the neighborhood assembled, and the down train from Chicago coming along in a short time, they got aboard of the cars and went to Ashkum for the purpose of effecting a rescue. Arriving at that place, the conductor ran into town without giving a signal, stopped but a moment, until the negroes could be rolled into the baggage car like so many hogs, and started his train without even attempting to make the usual signal.—The whole company of man stealers were there armed ready to prevent a rescue, and the Clifton men were compelled to jump off the train without trying to effect anything.

The three negroes were taken South by these Southern robbers, and ere this have undoubtedly been sold and the money pocketed.

The Illinois Central Railroad is charged with aiding and abetting operations similar to the above, and the free press of that State, is coming down on it after a fashion which it is believed will coerce it into a somewhat less infamous course.—*Centreville (Indiana) Free Repub.*

Family Miscellany.

For "The Principia."

PRAYER TO JEHOVAH.

Praise, praise to Jehovah, the glorious, the great,
Praise, praise him with shouting and song,
Praise, praise him ye orbs that his word did create,
Praise, praise him, ye cherubim strong.

O praise him, thou sun, with thy splendors, so bright,
Thou moon, with thy silvery beams:
O praise him, ye stars, in the stillness of night,
And praise him, ye wood-lands and streams.

Praise, praise him, ye lightnings, that dart from the cloud,
Ye thunders that roar on the seas;
Praise, praise him, ye tempests, ye cataracts loud,
Ye zephyrs that sigh through the trees.

O praise him, ye righteous, he loves the upright,
His praise is most comely for you;
The pure shall behold him, shall stand in his right,
And his beauties forever are new.

W. G.

For the Principia.

ECONOMY.

"Fail! Humph! there's no need of failing! Everything depends on whether you teach your family to retrench. My wife, now, knows, once for all, that I aint going to indulge her in every little gew-gaw she takes a fancy to—that I expect her to economize; and I tell you, sir, she's learned to do it! Catch her spending \$30 for a mantilla or \$10 for a hat, or \$1 a yard for a flimsy bit of lace or ribbon. She knows I wont have it! To be sure, she didn't exactly like it, at first, and used to pout her pretty lips and say that wasnt the way I did when I was courting her. But good gracious! a fellow can't be always courting—it's an expensive affair (though quite necessary) like furnishing a house, or setting up in business.

"But as I was saying, she's learned to economize—turns her dresses up side down, and inside out, trims her own hats, does her own sewing, and takes care of her own children, and it keeps her busy, so she don't get to brewing up trouble, and wanting to go to this and that and the other watering place, to show herself off! I'll tell you, sir, an economical wife is about the wisest investment a man can make?"

And Esq. Jones knocked the ashes off the end of his cigar, sank back in his easy chair, elevated his feet to a suitable level, and puffed away felicitously, his face still radiant with overflowing wisdom.

As Esq. Jones is a "representative man," of his own class, let us take observations on him, while he is making the atmosphere of the Reading Room redolent with the perfumes of tobacco.

He answers, quite well, the concise description of "fat, fair, and forty." He rejoices in white pants and vest, faultless shirt-bosom and collar, wears a huge ring on his little finger, sports a handsome watch-chain, and carries a gold headed cane. He does business in Wall street—which is to say, he has an office there, and looks in, every day or so, more or less, to see that Smith and Scrogs do their duty. He brings a friend or two home to dinner, occasionally, when he expects to find everything tip top: yet wonders, at every pay day, how Mrs. Jones could contrive to be so extravagant! He treats a fellow, sometimes, for Jones isn't a shabby man, not he! And it can just as well come out of his wife's laces and furbelows, that nobody'd miss. What does she want of such things, now? Hasn't she made her fortune, in capturing him, and what else are such things for? Jones takes a run up to Saratoga, or down to the sea side or around somewhere, for his health, occasionally, for he is very delicate; has the dispepsia, dreadfully, and the warm weather always overpowers him, and gives him sick headaches and what not! But Mrs. Jones never accompanies him, for that would just double the expense, and besides, who'd take care of the children? Jones isn't so unfeeling as to be willing to leave the little delicate, impressable shoots to the care of rude, ignorant, hirelings.

Mrs. Jones is, of course, a wee bit of a thin, pale woman, with soft voice and meek eyes, and devotes herself to the temporal interests of her worthy lord. Ought to be, if she is not, devotedly thankful that she was ever so happy as to strike his capricious fancy.

Isn't economy the queen of virtues—especially in a wife?

L

We clip the following from the *Home Oracle*, Kalamazoo, Mich., whether original in that paper, does not appear. But it touches a chord that will vibrate throughout city and country.

SAD WAIL OF A DRUNKARD'S DAUGHTER.

A young lady of New York was in the habit of writing on the subject of temperance. Her writing was so full of pathos, and evinced such deep emotion of soul, that a friend of hers, accused her of being a maniac on the subject, whereupon she wrote the following lines:—

Go feel what I have felt:
Go bear what I have borne—
Sink 'neath a blow a father dealt,
And the cold world's proud scorn;
Then suffer on from year to year,
The sole relief the scalding tear.

Go kneel as I have knelt,
Implore, beseech and pray—
Strive the besotted heart to melt,
The downward course to stay;
Be dashed with bitter curse aside,
Your prayers burlesqued, your tears defied.

Go weep as I have wept
O'er a loved father's fall—
See every promised blessing swept—
Youth's sweetness turned to gall;
Life's fading dowers strewed all the way,
That brought me up to woman's day.

Go see what I have seen,
Go see the strong man bowed—
With gnashing teeth, lips bathed in blood,
And cold and livid brow;
Go catch his withering glance and see
There mirrored his soul's misery.

Go to my mother's side,
And her crushed bosom cheer:
Thine own deep anguish hide;
Wipe from her cheeks the bitter tear.

Mark her worn frame and withered brow,
The gray that streaks her dark hair, now,
With fading frame and trembling limb,
And trace the ruin back to him
Whose plighted faith in early youth
Promised eternal love and truth,
But who, forsaken, has yielded up
The promise to the cursed cup;
And lead her down through love and life,
That lowly thing, a drunkard's wife;
And stamped on childhood's brow so mild
That withering blight, the drunkard's child.

THREE STEPS.

"If I do right, it is nobody's business how I feel," said Arthur. "But you ought to *think* right," said his brother; "thinking wrong is just as bad as *doing* wrong." "No, no," cried Arthur, "shooting a man, and only *wanting* to shoot him, I take to be very different—very different indeed." "Yes, different," said his brother, "but one commonly grows out of the other; so they have the same sap." "I don't understand you," said Arthur. "I may hate my boss as much as I please; but if I treat him well, it's nobody's business but my own; nobody can complain. I do hate him." "Whoever hateth his brother is a murderer, the Bible says." "Nobody is hung for his feelings," said Arthur.

The boys were not likely to convince each other, therefore we took up the thread of their talk; and as other boys may be interested, and we hope profited, we will give it to them.

There are commonly *three steps* in guilt. Have you ever read the history of Joseph, in the Bible? I dare say you are familiar with it. It illustrates, very clearly, each of these three steps.

The first is *wrong feeling*. Joseph's brothers, you know, were envious of him; they were jealous of their father's partiality for him; and lovely as he was, the Bible says, "they hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him." There might still have been kind treatment at home, and no one might have seen by their manner the feelings which lurked in their hearts; but their hearts had gone astray, and on the principles of God's law they had committed sin. There was guilt, not of action indeed, but of *feeling*. And the worst of it is, the wrong does not usually stop here. This is the danger.

It takes the next, the second step, *planning to do wrong—meaning to do wrong*. A great many things may hinder a person from *carrying out* his wicked feelings. The providence of God may restrain him from inflicting injury, however he may wish to do it. Did Joseph's brethren *lay plans* to do him harm? You remember his father sent him into the fields to see how his brothers and their flocks were getting along; and when "they saw him coming, they conspired against him to slay him." They said one to another, "Come now, therefore, and let us slay him, and cast him into some pit, and we will say some evil beast hath devoured him." Here you see the *guilty purpose*, when the mind in opposition to duty and conscience, *decides to do wrong*.

The third step, the outward act, is the last step. Did Joseph's

brothers *carry out* their wicked project? On his arriving, they seized the poor unoffending boy, and threw him down into a deep pit, and left him there to die of hunger and grief. Shortly after, some travelling traders coming along that way, they concluded to pull him up from the pit and sell him into slavery. This they did; and then killing, a kid, they dipped the poor boy's coat in the blood, and carried it home to his father as a proof that he had been eaten by wild beasts. This is the guilty *act*; and it is guilty actions only which the laws of men punish. Human laws are designed to *protect society*, and they punish according to the injury done. God's laws go a great way *behind* the act; they would *stop wrong in the beginning*. God looks at the heart as the real seat of right and wrong, and he would have every thing clean and pure *there*. Therefore it is *sinful feelings* by which he judges people. He says, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." The root of all evil is in the feeling.

So you see the danger of harboring *sinful thoughts*. They may ruin all your prospects for this world. And if not quite as bad as that, they always damage a person, in some way. But the solemn consideration is, *God judges you by them*. Arthur said "if he *did* right, it was nobody's business how he *felt*." It is true we look at the *conduct* of people, and are thankful for all good behavior: but it is Arthur's—it is every boy's, and every man's and woman's most important, most serious business, to look after the *state of his own heart*; for while man looketh at the outward appearance, God looketh at the heart.

Yes, boys, have you *hearts right, clean, pure*. There is the real seat of principles.—*Child's Paper*.

This is true and important. But we wish to put children and older people on their guard against an error that has lately come up, in a seemingly opposite direction. Some people pretend that they can have their *hearts right, clean, and pure*, when they are doing wicked actions, which God forbids. Some of them say that slaveholders can hold slaves as property, and buy and sell boys and girls, as they do calves and pigs, and yet have good christian feelings, and have *hearts right and clean and pure*! What do you think of such people, little children? And what do you think of those who will vote for a man to be President of the United States who will buy and sell little children? Do you think *they have clean right, pure hearts*, loving others as they do themselves, and doing as they would have others do to them? We don't believe any such thing. And we hope that when you, boys, grow up, to be men, you will read your Bibles about it, and learn better than to vote so wickedly.—*Ed. Principia*.

PERVERTED ELOQUENCE.

Lord Brougham, in his late address at Edinburgh University, alluded to the seductiveness of eloquent writing, saying:

"Historians and political reasoners—the instructors of the people—have ill-discharged their duty, partaking largely of the illusions of the vulgar which they were bound to dispel. Dazzled by the spectacle of their great abilities, and still more by their successful exertions, they have held up to admiration the worst enemies of mankind—the usurpers who destroyed their liberties—the conquerors who slew their men, who, in their pursuit of power or of fame, made no account of the greatest sufferings they could inflict on their fellow-creatures. The worst cruelty, the vilest falsehoods, have not prevented the teachers of the world from bestowing the name of great upon these scourges. Instead of holding up to our admiration the 'pride, pomp, and circumstance of glorious war,' it is the historian's duty to make us regard with unceasing delight the ease, worth and happiness of blessed peace. He must remember that 'peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war,' and to celebrate these triumphs of science, and the extension and security of freedom, in the improvement of national institutions, and the diffusion of general prosperity."

Breath fresh air if you would live long. In New England, farmers, who pass their days out of doors, live to an average of 64 years. The average age of persons who have in-door occupations at death is, in Massachusetts and Rhode Island: Shoemakers, 43; tailors, 42 1-2; editors, 41; druggists, jewelers, and teachers, from 39 to 40; machinists, 38 1-2; printers, 36 1-2. Fresh air, therefore, almost doubles life, while it more than doubles its capacity for enjoyment.

THE TALENT OF SUCCESS.

Every man must patiently abide his time. He must wait not in listless idleness, not in useless pastime, not in querulous dejection, but in constant, steady, cheerful endeavor, always willing, fulfilling and accomplishing his task, "that when the occasion comes he may be equal to the occasion." The talent of success is nothing more than doing what you can do well, without a thought of fame. If it comes at all, it will come because it is deserved, not because it is sought after. It is a very indiscreet and troublesome ambition which cares so much about fame, about what the world says of us, to be always looking in the face of others for approval—to be always anxious about the effect of what we do or say—be always shouting to hear the echoes of our own voices.—*Longfellow*.

PHYSICAL TRAINING.—Woe to the class or the nation that has no manly physical training!—Look at the manners, the morals, the faces of the young, of the shop-keeping classes, if you wish to see the effects of utterly neglecting the physical development of man; of fancying that all the muscular activity he requires under the sun, is to be able to stand behind a counter, or sit on a desk stool without tumbling off. Be sure, that ever since the days of the Persians of old, effeminacy, if not twin sister of cowardice and dishonesty, has always gone hand in hand with them. To that utter neglect of any exercise which calls out fortitude, patience, self-dependence, and daring, I attribute a great deal of the low sensuality, the concealed vulgarity, the utter want of a high sense of honor, which is increased just now among the middle classes, and from which the navigator, the engineer, the miner and the sailor are comparatively free.—*Kingley's Miscellanies*.

A REQUEST TO THOSE WHO OFFER THE WINE CUP AND SOCIAL GLASS.—Spare that young man! Oh spare him! tempt him not with the rosy goblet or social glass! Tell him that he was made for nobler things. Look at his form, cultivated intellect, and graceful manners. Destroy not these beautiful gifts! Spare him! Destroy not his usefulness, and bring on him disgrace, delirium-tremens, sickness, blotted hopes and remorse of conscience.—Destroy not his intellect, his body, his soul. Oh! spare him for the sake of his friends, bring not down their gray hairs with sorrow to the grave, remember that he is the pride of his family. Spare him to be useful to his God, his country and society. Tell him that although you can 'take in' the abandoned and degraded yet, you cannot destroy him! Tell him to step upon the platform of the noble, and there sway the sceptre of usefulness! Spare him for the sake of one who loves him!

SALTING MEAT.—A French professor denounces the use of salt-peter in brine intended for the preservation of fish for food. That part of the salt-peter which is absorbed by the meat, he says, is nitric acid—a deadly poison. He attributes to this chemical change all the diseases which are common to mariners and others, who subsist principally upon salted meat—such as scurvy, sore gums, decayed teeth, ulcers, etc., and advises total abandonment of salt-peter in pickle for beef, etc.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50	Postage 20cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00	Postage 25cts.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 75	Postage 10cts.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS,

FOR THE MILLIONS.

- I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
- II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
- III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
- IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.

With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. By *WILLIAM GOODELL*.

A summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinion* collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers &c.

PRICE, Single Copies, 12 cents; Per Dozen, One Dollar. Postage pre-paid, 3 cents per copy.

For sale by *WILLIAM GOODELL*, of M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the *Principia*, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH.

TERMS CASH.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

VOL. I.
Published W.
Harper's Building

TEARS: One
Direct business
as above.

Our object, by the
Christian reforms;
hinder crimes—the
taste, business arrangements,
the Church, the State
God, restoring the
type of heaven. Our
expediency, obedi-
ence; our panoply, the
way-marks

A REVIEW OF THE ASSEMBLIES IN HOLDERS.
The position
es of New Eng-
very, and to the
ment for its ab-
the action or no
Conferences,—
say, two years a
rica, is far from
of slavery. It is
that dreadful in-
neglected. Ho
the relation of C
and in view of t
harbor slavery
es, pulpits, and
In our days
not devotees, who
slaves? But the
ways had, making
suffering human
served among them.

Infidelity was
the guilty silent
sin of the age,
becoming the rule
try and time. The
1860, when
with a fearful ad-
years, and when
campaign, of which
ly vital question
associations and
lieve, not a single
pious platitudes,
slavery, or the
bring the verdict
against either of

When even the
and associations
very proclivities
the high commis-
been seen, for in
of our institutions

"We have evi-
the slave trade
spite of our laws,